



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/506,368	01/21/2005	Frederick Mark Manasseh	0004800USU/2279	1079
27623	7590	09/17/2008	EXAMINER	
OHLANDT, GREELEY, RUGGIERO & PERLE, LLP ONE LANDMARK SQUARE, 10TH FLOOR STAMFORD, CT 06901			WANG, KENT F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			09/17/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/506,368	MANASSEH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	KENT WANG	2622	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 10 July 2008.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-54 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
- Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
- Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The amendments, filed on 07/10/2008, have been entered and made of record. Claims 44-54 have been added. Claims 1-54 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 11-15, filed 07/10/2008, with respect to independent claims 1, 23, 43 and dependent claim 18 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunetti (US 6,507,278) in view of Houvener (US 6,757,408), and further in view of Colmenarez (US 2002/0167403).

Regarding claim 1, Brunetti discloses an apparatus (an ingress/egress control system 10, Fig 1) for the analysis of at least two captured interactions (Figs 8 and 9 provide ingress and egress activities) associated with a traveler and an agent, the apparatus comprising:

- an at least one first station (an ingress or Q section 12, Fig 1) for capturing video of an at least one first agent-traveler interaction along a traveler path (6:25-45); and
- an at least one second station (an egress or X section 14, Fig 1) for capturing video of an at least one second agent-traveler interaction along the traveler path (6:25-45).

Brunetti does not specifically teach an apparatus for the analysis of a captured interaction associated with a traveler and an agent. However Houvener does teach an apparatus (security identification system) for the analysis of a captured interaction associated with a traveler and an agent (provides high quality data capture and screening by leveraging the interaction between screening personnel, i.e. an agent and people being screened, i.e. a traveler) (6:5-12).

Brunetti and Houvener do not specifically teach a station for capturing audio, video, and data, and an analysis device for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction. However Colmenarez does teach a station (a capture/segmentation process 510, Fig 3) for capturing audio, video, and data (a capture/segmentation process 510 captures video, image, audio, and other data relating to the customer), and an analysis device (comparison engine 520, Fig 3) for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (comparing the images of a customer entering and leaving amounts to comparing two images) ([0026]-[0030], Colmenarez).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the security identification system as taught by Houvener into Brunetti' system, as the combination yields a systematic, uniform, natural, efficient and optimal data collection process and increases the likelihood of detecting a known high-risk individual, and

minimizes the number of false positive identifications, thus the system provides a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person (6:13-24, Houvener).

Further, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capturing and comparison mechanism as taught by Colmenarez into Brunetti and Houvener' system, as the data is used by a comparison engine according to the exact requirements of the comparison mechanism and selecting the best match between the profiles and if a match cannot be found, the comparison engine generates an alarm, such as is done at security check points at airport terminals ([0026]-[0027] and [0034], Colmenarez).

Regarding claim 23, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the claim 1 is an apparatus claim whereas claim 23 is a method. Thus the method claim 23 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

5. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Brunetti (US 6,507,278) in view of Colmenarez (US 2002/0167403).

Regarding claim 43, Brunetti discloses a method for traveler interactions management comprising:

- capturing first information at a first predetermined locations (an ingress or Q section 12, Fig 1) along a traveler path (6:25-45);
- capturing second information at a second predetermined location (an egress or X section 14, Fig 1) along a traveler path (6:25-45);
- recording the captured first and second information (Figs 8 and 9 provide ingress and egress information) (12:6-16);and

- storing the recorded first and second audio, video, and data information on a storage device (the information, as well as audio if desired, is loaded onto a hard drive of the computer) (7:61-8:4)
- wherein said first and said second predetermined locations are substantially non-overlapping (an ingress or Q section 12 and an egress or X section 14, Fig 1) (6:25-45).

Brunetti does not specifically teach a station for capturing audio, video, and data, and an analysis device for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction. However Colmenarez does teach a station (a capture/segmentation process 510, Fig 3) for capturing audio, video, and data (a capture/segmentation process 510 captures video, image, audio, and other data relating to the customer), and an analysis device (comparison engine 520, Fig 3) for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (comparing the images of a customer entering and leaving amounts to comparing two images) ([0026]-[0030], Colmenarez).

Thus, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capturing and comparison mechanism as taught by Colmenarez into Brunetti's system, as the data is used by a comparison engine according to the exact requirements of the comparison mechanism and selecting the best match between the profiles and if a match cannot be found, the comparison engine generates an alarm, such as is done at security check points at airport terminals ([0026]-[0027] and [0034], Colmenarez).

6. Claims 1-17, 19-42, 46-47, 50 and 53-54 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters (US 6,396,535) in view of Houvener (US 6,757,408), and further in view of Colmenarez (US 2002/0167403).

Regarding claim 1, Waters discloses an apparatus (situation awareness system) for the analysis of at least two captured image, the apparatus comprising:

- an at least one first station (camera 101, Fig 1) for capturing an at least one first image along a traveler path (arrow 301 shows the direction of movement of objects, i.e. vehicle, pedestrian, other traffic, and so forth) (3:53-67);
- an at least one second station (camera 102, Fig 1) for capturing an at least one second interaction along the traveler path (3:53-67); and
- an analysis device (an analyzer synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for comparing the at least one second interaction (camera 102, Fig 1) with the at least one first interaction (camera 101, Fig 1) (2:46-58 and Figs 1-2).

Waters does not specifically teach an apparatus for the analysis of a captured interaction associated with a traveler and an agent. However Houvener does teach an apparatus (security identification system) for the analysis of a captured interaction associated with a traveler and an agent (provides high quality data capture and screening by leveraging the interaction between screening personnel, i.e. an agent and people being screened, i.e. a traveler) (6:5-12).

Waters and Houvener do not specifically teach a station for capturing audio, video, and data. However Colmenarez does teach a station (a capture/segmentation process 510, Fig 3)

for capturing audio, video, and data (a capture/segmentation process 510 captures video, image, audio, and other data relating to the customer) ([0026], Colmenarez).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the security identification system as taught by Houvener into Waters' system, as the combination yields a systematic, uniform, natural, efficient and optimal data collection process and increases the likelihood of detecting a known high-risk individual, and minimizes the number of false positive identifications, thus the system provides a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person (6:13-24, Houvener).

Further, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capturing and comparison mechanism as taught by Colmenarez into Waters and Houvener' system, as the data obtained is used by a comparison engine according to the exact requirements of the comparison mechanism, such as is done at security check points at airport terminals ([0026]-[0027] and [0034], Colmenarez).

Regarding claim 2, Waters discloses a control station (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for storing the at least one first and second interactions captured (2:46-58).

Regarding claim 3, Waters discloses an alarm identifier device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for identifying an alarm situation (certain dangerous situation or event are recognized) based on the comparing of the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (multiple attributed objects are analyzed to detect events) (2:46-3:2).

Regarding claim 4, Waters discloses an alarm-generating device (an output device 150, i.e. a bell, Fig 1) for generating an alarm (alerts 252, Fig 2) associated with an alarm situation

(certain dangerous situation or event are recognized) identified by the alarm identifier device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) (2:46-3-2).

Regarding claim 5, Waters discloses a station poll data device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for polling stations (video streams 115, Figs 1-2) for the at least one first and second interactions (multiple video cameras 101-106, Fig 1) (2:46-3:12).

Regarding claim 6, Waters discloses a station transfer data device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for managing data (extracting temporal and spatial data from the video streams to identify objects and their attributes) transferred from stations for the at least one first and second interactions (multiple video cameras 101-106, Fig 1) (2:46-58).

Regarding claim 7, Waters discloses a database (partially attributed data objects 231, Fig 2) for storing and retrieving the at least one first and second interactions (3:18-42).

Regarding claim 8, Waters discloses a replay device (output device 120, Fig 1) for replaying at the least one first or second interactions (e.g. generating a synthetic display of multiple video cameras 101-106) (2:35-58).

Regarding claim 9, Waters discloses an object tracking device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for tracking an object within the at least one first or second interactions (various kinds of template matching schemes can be used to fully identify specific commonly occurring objects, such as, traveler and the like) (3:32-42).

Regarding claim 10, Waters discloses at least one first and second stations (camera 101 and 102, Fig 1) comprise at least one video capturing device (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2), an at least one audio recording device (synthesizer 250, Fig 2), an at least one data capture device (data analyzer 240, Fig 2). More specifically, Waters discloses at least one video

capturing device for capturing video of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2), an at least one audio recording device for capturing audio of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (synthesizer 250, Fig 2), an at least one data capture device for capturing data of the at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (data analyzer 240, Fig 2), an at least one storage device (a cache 530, Fig 3) and an at least one storage device (secondary data 238, Fig 2) and an at least one data retrieval device (data render 260, Fig 2) (3:4-51, Waters).

Regarding claim 11, Waters discloses at least one first station and second station are located in the same transportation port (e.g. multiple cameras can be arranged to obtain a full field of view of an area of interest) (2:21-28).

Regarding claim 12, Waters discloses at least one first station and second station are located in remote transportation ports (e.g. a camera can transmit the data element from/to a remote location) (4:17-26).

Regarding claim 13, Waters discloses a second control room for recording and storing the at least one first and second interactions (e.g. image data of camera can transmit the data element from/to a remote control location) (4:17-26).

Regarding claim 14, Waters discloses a local or remote operator for observing the operation of the apparatus (the apparatus can be under user control and the user can supply control signal to the system) (4:17-26).

Regarding claim 15, Waters discloses the control station comprises a recording and retrieval system (information extracting from digital video data 201, data generating by analyzer 240, and data converting by synthesizer 250) (3:4-51).

Regarding claim 16, Waters discloses the capturing is performed in real time to be analyzed upon capture (operating in real-time) (2:46-58).

Regarding claim 17, Waters discloses the transportation port is an airport (4:27-30).

Regarding claim 19, Waters discloses at least one first and at least one second interactions comprise a captured data, video and audio (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2, audio synthesizer 250, Fig 2, and data analyzer 240, Fig 2) depicting the interaction between the agent and the traveler (an event 242 generated by analyzing the relationships among the attributed objects, e.g. between a agent and a traveler) (3:4-51).

Regarding claim 20, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Houvener discloses a quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the identity verification system) for analyzing the at least one first or second interaction for analyzing the quality of service provided to the traveler by the agent, the quality assurance device using an at least one evaluation form of the apparatus (provides high quality data capture and screening by leveraging the interaction between screening personnel, i.e. an agent and people being screened, i.e. a traveler) (6:5-12 and 8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the interactive multi-media training module as taught by Houvener into Waters' system, as the combination permitting a large organization to assure that their field personnel are providing

high quality customer service in a method that is considerably more efficient and effective than sending them to the field for auditing and training purpose (8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 21, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Houvener discloses the quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the identity verification system) alerts a supervisor where the quality of service provided by an agent fails to meet a predetermined standard (immediately react to issue noted) (6:5-12 and 8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 22, the limitations of claims 1 and 20 are taught above, Houvener discloses the quality assurance device (an interactive multi-media training module of the identity verification system) initiates a training session with an agent (the field personnel are prompted to participate in a training session at the next convenient time such as at the start of their next shift) (8:36-9:6, Houvener).

Regarding claim 23, this claim differs from claim 1 only in that the claim 1 is an apparatus claim whereas claim 23 is a method. Thus the method claim 23 is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 1 above.

Regarding claim 24, this claim recites same limitations as claims 10 and 13 combined. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 10 and 13 above.

Regarding claims 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31 and 32, these claims recite same limitations as claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9 and 10 above.

Regarding claim 33, this claim recites same limitations as claim 20. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 20 above.

Regarding claims 34, 35, 36 and 37, these claims recite same limitations as claims 11, 12, 13, and 15, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 11, 12, 13, and 15 above.

Regarding claim 38, Waters discloses at least one and second interactions comprise a captured data, video and audio (video cameras 101-106, Fig 2, audio synthesizer 250, Fig 2, and data analyzer 240, Fig 2) depicting the interaction between the agent and the traveler (an event 242 generated by analyzing the relationships among the attributed objects, e.g. between a agent and a traveler) (3:4-51).

Regarding claim 39, Waters discloses an alarm identifier device (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) for identifying an alarm situation (certain dangerous situation or event are recognized) based on the comparing of the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (multiple attributed objects are analyzed to detect events) (2:46-3:2).

Regarding claim 40, Waters discloses a local or remote operator for observing the operation of the apparatus (the apparatus can be under user control and the user can supply control signal to the system) (4:17-26).

Regarding claim 41, this claim recites same limitations as claim 21. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 21 above.

Regarding claim 42, this claim recites same limitations as claim 6. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 6 above.

Regarding claim 46, Waters discloses the data capture device is a screen capture device (A security screen located at the portal screens each passenger as they pass through the portal for the presence of items such as firearms and explosives which are prohibited) (4:28-48).

Regarding claim 47, this claim recites same limitations as claim 7. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 7 above.

Regarding claim 50, Houvener discloses a step of checking whether a luggage belonging to the traveler has changed (the system may provide a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person) (6:13-25, Houvener).

Regarding claim 53, the limitations of claims 23 and 24 are taught above, Colmenarez discloses a capture/segmentation process 510 captures video, image, audio, and other data relating to the customer ([0026], Colmenarez) and Houvener discloses the visual prompting of the screener, in synchronization with the collection system, yields a systematic, uniform, natural, efficient and optimal data collection process (6:13-25, Houvener). Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capture processor as taught by Colmenarez into Houvener and Waters' system, as the audio, video, and data can be recorded synchronously.

Regarding claim 54, this claim recites same limitations as claim 46. Thus it is analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claim 46 above.

7. Claims 18, 44-45 and 51-52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters in view of Houvener, and further in view of Brunetti (US 6,507,278).

Regarding claim 18, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brunetti discloses the interaction is associated with a baggage item (the system may provide a safeguard that ensures that each passenger boarded a plane, that their luggage is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person, thus the interaction is associated with a baggage item) (6:13-25, Houvener).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the baggage check system as taught by Houvener into Waters' system, as the combination yields a systematic process to increase the likelihood of detecting a known high-risk baggage, and minimizes the number of false positive identifications, thus provides a safeguard that ensures that luggage of each traveler is on the plane, and that the luggage is later claimed by the correct person (6:13-25, Houvener).

Regarding claim 44, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction (an ingress activity or Q section 12, Fig 1) is of a different type from the at least one second agent-traveler interaction (an egress activity or X section 14, Fig 1) (6:25-45).

Regarding claim 45, the limitations of claim 1 are taught above, Brunetti discloses at least one first agent-traveler interaction or the at least one second agent-traveler interaction is selected from the group consisting of: ticket purchasing, baggage screening, check-in, passport control, passenger screening; and boarding (a multi-stage screening of passengers entering the checkpoint) (3:21-38).

Regarding claims 51 and 52, these claims recite same limitations as claims 44 and 45, respectively. Thus they are analyzed and rejected as previously discussed with respect to claims 44 and 45 above.

8. Claim 43 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters in view of Brunetti, and further in view of Colmenarez (US 2002/0167403).

Regarding claim 43, Waters discloses a method for traveler interactions management (an event 242 generated by analyzing the relationships among the attributed objects, e.g. between a agent and a traveler) capturing information at predetermined locations along a traveler path (multiple video cameras 101-106 along the direction of movement of objects, Figs 1, 3); recording the captured information (information extracting from digital video data 201 and data generating by analyzer 240); storing the recorded information on a storage device (data segment 230 and secondary data 238, Fig 2), and analyzing the recorded information (analyzing synthesizer 200, Fig 1) (2:21-58, 3:4-47, and 63-67, and 4:1-30).

Waters does not specifically teach capturing and recording first and second audio, video, and data information wherein said first mad said second predetermined locations are substantially non- overlapping. However, Brunetti discloses an apparatus (an ingress/egress control system 10, Fig 1) for the analysis of one first station (an ingress or Q section 12, Fig 1) and one second station (an egress or X section 14, Fig 1) wherein said first mad said second predetermined locations are substantially non- overlapping (6:25-45).

Waters and Brunetti do not specifically teach a station for capturing audio, video, and data, and an analysis device for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction. However Colmenarez does teach a station (a capture/segmentation

process 510, Fig 3) for capturing audio, video, and data (a capture/segmentation process 510 captures video, image, audio, and other data relating to the customer), and an analysis device (comparison engine 520, Fig 3) for comparing the at least one second interaction with the at least one first interaction (comparing the images of a customer entering and leaving amounts to comparing two images) ([0026]-[0030], Colmenarez).

Thus, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the ingress/egress passenger screening system as taught by Brunetti into Waters' system, as the ingress and egress portions of the security system can be implemented separately and operates as unobtrusively as possible without compromising security at the checkpoint, and while improving passenger flow and substantially eliminating bottlenecks (2:66-3:5 and 4:21-28, Brunetti).

Further, it would have been also obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the capturing and comparison mechanism as taught by Colmenarez into Brunetti and Waters' system, as the data is used by a comparison engine according to the exact requirements of the comparison mechanism and selecting the best match between the profiles and if a match cannot be found, the comparison engine generates an alarm, such as is done at security check points at airport terminals ([0026]-[0027] and [0034], Colmenarez).

9. Claims 48 and 49 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Waters in view of Houvener, and further in view of Eilbacher (US 6,724,887).

Regarding claim 48, the limitations of claims 23 and 47 are taught above, Waters and Houvener do not disclose the analysis is spotting words said by the traveler. However, Eilbacher discloses the spotting words analysis technique (an analyzing unit 234 is a voice

processing stress analyzer, in the case of word spotting, an analysis is performed on recorded audio such as a telephone call and the audio is automatically processed, searching for any key words on a predefined list which have been identified as cause for concern) (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the spotting words analysis technique as taught by Eilbacher into Waters and Houvener's system, as the word spotting analysis can be done separately, or in addition to the stress analysis, which might tend to indicate an suspected customer experience, as the analysis is spotting words said by the traveler (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

Regarding claim 49, the limitations of claims 23 and 47 are taught above, Waters and Houvener do not disclose the analysis is stress detection of the traveler. However, Eilbacher discloses the stress detection and analysis technique (an analyzing unit 234 is a voice processing stress analyzer which can be used to perform the stress detection of the traveler) (11:26-61, Eilbacher).

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure: Soames (US 3,617,631), Chun (US 6,956,477), Kinoshita et al. (US 2002/0193973), Yagesh et al. (US 2003/0171939), and Schoen et al. (US 7,231,355).
11. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a).
Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kent Wang whose telephone number is 571-270-1703. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 A.M. - 5:30 PM (every other Friday off). If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ngoc Yen Vu can be reached on 571-272-7320. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-270-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or

access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

KW
11 September 2008

*/Ngoc-Yen T. VU/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2622*